


ORIGINAL

 Lampert & O'Connor, P.C.  
1750 K Street NW  
Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20006

RECEIVED

NOV - 4 2002

Tel 202/887-6230  
Fax 202/887-6231

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Linda L. Kent  
kent@l-o-law.com

VIA HAND DELIVERY

November 4, 2002

**EX PARTE** \_\_\_\_

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room TW-A325  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: *Ex Parte* Presentation  
CC Docket No. 01-337

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On November 1, 2002, Steven Teplitz, Vice President and Associate General Counsel, AOL Time Warner Inc. ("AOL"), Donna N. Lampert and the undersigned, both of Lampert and O'Connor, P.C., met with Jeff Carlisle, Senior Deputy Bureau Chief, Jane Jackson, Associate Bureau Chief, Scott Bergman, Legal Counsel to the Bureau Chief, and Brent Olson, Deputy Division Chief of the Competition Policy Division, of the Wireline Competition Bureau, to discuss the above-referenced docket.

In the meeting, consistent with AOL's Reply Comments filed on April 22, 2002, we explained that regardless of the classification adopted by the Commission, the *Computer Inquiry* rules are necessary to promote full and open information services competition thereby maintaining the investment, innovation and consumer welfare experienced today and to spur the future growth and demand for broadband services. We also noted that the court in *ASCENT v FCC* did not permit the Commission to use an affiliate to avoid compliance with statutory obligations.

No. of Dockets added \_\_\_\_\_  
List Added \_\_\_\_\_

0 + 2

November 4, 2002

Page 2

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules, two copies of this letter and the attachment are being provided to you for inclusion in the public record in the above-captioned proceeding. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Linda L. Kent

Counsel for AOL Time Warner Inc

cc: Jeff Carlisle  
Jane Jackson  
Scott Bergman  
Brent Olson



**ORIGINAL**  
**N A R U C**  
National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners

William M. Nugent, *President*  
Maine Public Utilities Commission  
David A. Svanda, *First Vice President*  
Michigan Public Service Commission  
Stan Wise, *Second Vice President*  
Georgia Public Service Commission

Constance B. White, *Treasurer*  
Utah Public Service Commission  
Charles D. Gray, *Executive Director*  
Washington, DC Office

**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
RECEIVED**

November 4, 2002

Ms. Marlene Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

NOV - 4 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**RE: Notice of Written and Oral Ex Parte Comments - Two Originals filed in the proceeding captioned: *In the Matter of Numbering Resource Optimization, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 99-200; CC Docket No. 96-98; CC Docket No 96-116; FCC 02-73 (Rel. March 14, 2002).***

Dear Secretary Dortch,

The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) respectfully urges the FCC to act quickly in the above captioned proceeding to affirm its earlier December 2001 finding that ALL carriers in the top 100 MSA meet the current pooling and porting deadlines, regardless of whether they have received a specific request ("BFR") from another carrier to provide LNP.

This letter is being provided to each FCC Commissioner's office. In addition, the undersigned spoke with FCC Commissioner Kevin Martin covering the substance of this letter on October 28, 2002. During the previous week, Mr. Ramsay also spoke by phone with Jordan Goldstein, Sam Peder, and Dan Gonzales covering the basic arguments outlined below.

The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners has been very vocal in pressing for an end to industry requested deadline extensions. We also strongly pressed for elimination of the requirement for a "BFR" for all carriers operating in the top 100 MSAs.

We anticipated, based on, *inter alia*, the text of the March *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* ("FNPRM"), that the FCC would create a record and vote quickly on the issues presented. Indeed, as outlined below, the FNPRM reiterated the FCC's findings (and NARUC's arguments supporting the original FCC findings) that "(1) allowing customers to respond to price and service changes without changing their telephone numbers, (2) enabling carriers to alleviate number shortages by implementing code sharing and other mechanisms to transfer unused numbers among carriers that need numbering resources." The FNPRM also said: "These benefits weigh in favor of a requirement that all local exchange carriers and covered CMRS carriers in the top 100 MSAs be LNP-capable, regardless of whether they receive a request from a competing carrier. Similarly, these benefits indicate that carriers entering markets in the largest 100 MSAs should be required to be LNP-capable upon entry." We agree and urge the FCC to act quickly to confirm its December 2001 findings.

*The December Order*

Commendably, the FCC's December 28, 2001 *Third NRO Report and Order* eliminated the BFR requirement to respond to a number of state comments that they could not implement pooling throughout an entire MSA, because some carriers had not implemented LNP in certain exchanges within that MSA. Specifically, the FCC found:

"Sonic states have advised that not all wireline carriers in the top 100 MSAs are LNP capable. Apparently, some carriers have interpreted our rules to require LNP capability only when a request is received from a competing carrier, even in the top 100 MSAs. This issue was brought to light when state pooling trials were implemented and certain carriers had not acquired the necessary capability to participate in thousands-block number pooling. We therefore clarify, on our own motion, that the LNP and pooling requirements extend to all carriers in the largest 100 MSAs, regardless of whether they have received a specific request to provide LNP from another carrier. We also clarify that the "top 100 MSAs" include those MSAs listed in the LNP First Report and Order."

The FCC also clarified that the BFR requirement now only applied outside the top 100 MSAs.

*The March Order and FNPRM*

However, in March of 2002, reacting to industry allegations that it had failed to provide procedural due process before acting, the FCC, on its own motion, reconsidered its findings in the *Numbering Resource Optimization Third Report and Order*, 67 FR 6431 (Feb. 12, 2002), regarding the local number portability (LNP). Specifically, this *Third Order on Reconsideration*, 67 FR 16332 (Apr. 5, 2002) reverses the FCC's December 2001 clarification that these requirements extend to all carriers within the largest 100 MSAs, regardless of whether they have received a specific request from another carrier to provide LNP. Simultaneously, the FCC issued a further NPRM in the above captioned proceeding to determine if it should confirm its December findings:

"For the reasons explained below, we seek comment in the Further Notice on whether we should again extend the LNP requirements to all carriers in the largest 100 MSAs, regardless of whether they receive a request to provide LNP. We also seek comment on whether all carriers in the top 100 MSAs should be required to participate in thousands-block number pooling, regardless of whether they are required to be LNP capable."

The further NPRM cites with approval NARUC's basic arguments for extending the BFR exemption to wireless carriers noting:

"Upon initially requiring all local exchange carriers and covered CMRS carriers to provide number portability in the largest 100 MSAs, the Commission found that number portability contributes to the development of competition among alternative providers by, among other things, allowing customers to respond to price and service changes without changing their telephone numbers. LNP also can enable carriers *to* alleviate number shortages by implementing code sharing and other mechanisms to transfer unused numbers among carriers that need numbering resources. These benefits weigh in favor of a requirement that all local exchange carriers and covered CMRS carriers in the top 100 MSAs be LNP-capable, regardless of whether they receive a request from a competing carrier. Similarly, these benefits indicate that carriers entering markets in the largest 100 MSAs should be required to be LNP-capable upon entry. *We seek comment on whether these benefits to competition and numbering resource optimization warrant a reinstatement of the original LNP requirement for all local exchange carriers and covered CMRS carriers in the largest 100 MSAs.* We also seek comment on whether certain small carriers that have switches either within the largest 100 MSAs or in areas adjoining the largest 100 MSAs, but provide service to no or few customers within the MSA, should be exempt from the LNP requirement because they are not likely to receive a request **for** LNP. (Emphasis Added)."

Again, we urge the FCC to act decisively *to* confirm the findings of the December order and eliminate the BFR requirement for all carriers operating in the top 100MSAs.

**As** always, if you have any questions about this filing, please do not hesitate to contact me at 202.898.2207 or jramsay@naruc.org.

Sincerely,



James Bradford Ramsay  
NARUC General Counsel

cc: Jordan Goldstein  
Dan Gonzalez  
Sam Feder  
Matt Brill  
Christopher Libertelli